

Draft Request for Proposals Question and Response Matrix

The following Matrix includes NHDOT's responses to questions and comments submitted by the shortlisted Proposers regarding the US Route 4 over Bunker Creek Replacement Project Draft RFP received by the June 27, 2018 deadline.

No.	Doc/Section/Page No.	Question/Comment	Department Response
-----	----------------------	------------------	---------------------

Proposal Contents			
1	No Reference Provided	Please remove the requirement for each of the three (3) shortlisted Design-Builders to provide a detailed and comprehensive Project Management Plan (PMP). Suggest that NHDOT request an outline of the PMP and confirmation by the Design-Builder that the key management personnel listed in the RFQ response is still valid. Retain the requirement for a comprehensive PMP be required for the selected Design-Builder.	The Department will reduce the RFP requirement for the Project Management plan to a detailed Project Management Summary, with the requirement that the selected Design-Build Team will prepare a comprehensive PMP. This change will be reflected in Volume 1 Section 5.4 of the Final RFP.
2	No Reference Provided	Please remove the requirement for each of the three (3) shortlisted Design-Builders to provide a detailed and comprehensive Quality Management Plan (QMP). Suggest that NHDOT request an outline of the QMP and confirmation by the Design-Builder that the key quality personnel indicated in the RFQ response is still valid. Retain the requirement for a comprehensive QMP be required for the selected Design-Builder.	The Department will reduce the RFP requirement for the Quality Management Plan to a detailed Quality Management Summary, with the requirement that the selected Design-Build Team will prepare a comprehensive QMP. This change will be reflected in Volume 1 Section 5.4 of the Final RFP.

Draft Request for Proposals Question and Response Matrix

3	No Reference Provided	<p>The amount of project overhead as outlined in the Draft RFP seems disproportional to the relatively small size of the project. Can these requirements be scaled down to reflect the size of this project? This could include (a) combining the Quality Control Administrator position with the Construction Quality Control Manager (Volume II, Book 2, p. 29), (b) having NHDOT perform Acceptance inspection and testing rather than the Construction QC Audit Team (Volume II, Book 2, Section 3.7.5.1.3, page 45), (c) minimizing the requirements of the Public Information and Communications Plan (Volume II, Book 2, Section 5), (d) minimizing requirements of the technical proposal, (e) use NHDOT Standard Specifications more rather than project specific specifications.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The Department will allow for the positions of <u>Quality Control Administrator</u> and <u>Design Quality Control Manager</u> to be filled by the same person, as long as the specified individual meets the requirements of both positions as described in the RFQ. The <u>Quality Control Administrator</u> and <u>Construction Quality Control Manager</u> positions shall be filled by separate individuals in order to maintain oversight that the design is being implemented correctly in the field. This change will be reflected in the Final RFP. b. The Design-Build Team shall be responsible for Quality Control as specified in Volume II, Book 1, Section 5 (page 31). Acceptance Testing and Inspection will be performed by NHDOT as stated in Volume II, Book 1, Section 5 (5.5 specifically) and Volume II, Book 2, Section 3.1. c. Due to the 14 day closure of US Route 4, an important east-west corridor, the Department feels it is important to maintain good contact with the public and the travelling public. For this reason the requirements set forth in Volume II, Book 2, Section 5, will be maintained. d. Other than changes noted within this document, requirements will remain as is. e. As the Project is Design-Build and the procurement process differs from the standard Design-Bid-Build process, the Department maintains the necessity of project specific specifications along with NHDOT Standard Specification. Please see Volume II, Book 1, Section 1.3 for the specified Order of Precedence.
---	-----------------------	--	--

Draft Request for Proposals Question and Response Matrix

4	No Reference Provided	<p>Even if the PMP and QMP are addressed by the Department significant administrative and engineering cost/effort is required to respond to the RFP and to accurately bid the project including preliminary: Bridge Design, Foundation Design, Wall Design, Geotechnical Analysis, Hydrology & Hydraulics, Roadway Design, Drainage Design/Water Quality Treatment Design, and Traffic Control Design.</p> <p>Accordingly, please increase the \$35,000 stipend to more accurately reflect the effort and risk by the two, eventually unsuccessful, Design-Build Teams.</p>	See answers to Questions #1 - #3. The Stipend amount of \$35,000 will remain unchanged.
5	Volume II, Book 1, Section 5.5.2 (page 32)	Will the D-B contractor be responsible for fabrication shop independent third-party quality control inspection and testing, or will NHDOT?	As stated in Volume II, Book 1, Section 5.5.1 (page 32), the Design-Build Team is be responsible for all Quality Control. However, as stated in Volume II, Book 1, Section 5.5.2, NHDOT will have the right to oversee QC testing and/or conduct acceptance testing.

Draft Request for Proposals Question and Response Matrix

Subsurface Exploration			
6	No Reference Provided	<p>Borings were conducted by NHDOT prior to issuance of the RFQ and included the completion of Standard Penetration Tests (SPTs) only. In-situ strength tests (i.e., field vane shear testing) and laboratory tests (e.g., strength and compressibility) were not performed on collected samples of the soft, compressible soils that are present at the site. These tests would provide more accurate information relative to the strength and compressibility of the soils at the site and would allow the bidders to complete a thorough and accurate evaluation of both settlement and global stability issues at the abutments and approach embankments. We are requesting that NHDOT perform additional subsurface explorations to provide this information to all bidders for use in determining geotechnical design requirements for the abutments and embankments. We suggest that the subsurface exploration program include the following, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One test boring drilled at each embankment, located on the north side of the existing embankment. In-situ vane shear tests in the tidal marine deposit and marine clay deposit, in addition to some supplemental SPTs. • Collection of two to four undisturbed tube samples from each boring. • Laboratory consolidation tests and CIUC triaxial shear tests on the tidal marine deposit and marine clay deposit. <p>Cone penetrometer testing (CPT) could be conducted instead of borings at each embankment. Continuous CPT data would be collected at both locations until cone refusal is achieved in the soils below the marine clay deposit. The result of the investigation would provide the bidders continuous shear strength profiles of the soft, cohesive soils. Penetration of the pavement section and existing embankment fill soils would need to be considered if NHDOT decides to conduct CPTs instead of test borings.</p>	<p>The Department is developing a plan for Supplemental Subsurface Explorations in order to supply the Design-Build Teams with additional information on the compressible soils at the site. Please note that the further investigations by the Department are not intended to serve as a complete geotechnical evaluation for the final design. They are intended to provide information to aid in the development of the Design-Build Team's technical proposal. The Supplement Subsurface Explorations are expected to include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two additional test borings in the vicinity of the previous borings, B202 and B203 • Three undisturbed sample will be obtained in each boring at the following approximate depths: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 20-30' (stiffer marine crust) 2. 45' (very soft marine) 3. 75' (very soft) • Performance of Vane shear testing above the middle sample collected in each boring • Laboratory testing to include consolidation testing <p>Volume II, Book 2, Section 7.2.2.3 of the Final RFP has been modified as a result of this supplemental exploration program.</p>

Draft Request for Proposals Question and Response Matrix

7	Volume I, Section 2.7 (page 16) Volume II, Book 2, Section 7.2, (page 78)	Given that the successful bidder will need to address the time-rate and magnitude of settlement of the marine silts and clays at the site to prepare a competitive bid, and that the geotechnical exploration program included very limited laboratory testing and no in-situ testing of the clay, we believe that additional subsurface explorations and laboratory testing are required. It will be very difficult based on the current schedule for contractors to initiate a supplemental boring program to acquire necessary information. In addition, logistically it will be difficult for all three D/B teams to schedule and complete their boring programs independently. Will NHDOT initiate a supplemental boring program and allow each team a defined number of borings at locations provided by the team?	See answer to Question #6.
8	Volume I, Section 2.7 (page 16) Volume II, Book 2, Section 7.2 (page 78)	If it is the desire of NHDOT to have each team self-perform the supplemental geotechnical explorations and lab testing prior to submitting the proposal, will NHDOT increase the proposed \$35k stipend to cover these costs?	See answer to Question #6. The Stipend amount of \$35,000 will remain unchanged.
9	Volume II, Book 2, Section 7.8 (page 97)	Includes requirements for Traffic Management Plans. If supplemental borings are needed to finalize geotechnical design recommendations, would a traffic management plan be required and would NHDOT expect the DB teams to prepare the TMPs?	For pre-construction data collection activities such as completion of subsurface explorations, only a site specific Traffic Control Plan is needed. The Traffic Management Plan is an element required to be submitted by the selected Design-Build Team prior to the construction phase of the project.
10	No Reference Provided	Are there any limitations on when and where the Design-Builder can perform the test borings? For example: are borings limited to within limits of roadway due to any environmental or permitting issues; are there time or day restrictions; are there any other restrictions?	Any borings completed by the Design-Build Team that are in wetlands need to adhere to the NHDES Wetland rules for conducting borings. Depending upon the wetland type and drilling equipment used, either the "permit by rule" approach would be applicable or a wetland permit would be needed. The time restrictions for project work also apply to when test borings could be completed as well as lane closure restrictions in the roadway.

Draft Request for Proposals Question and Response Matrix

11	Volume II, Book 2, Section 7.2.2.1(7) (page 79)	Indicates the following should be included in the Geotechnical Design Report(s) provided by the Design-Builder's Geotechnical Engineer: "Field investigations and laboratory test results used to characterize conditions, including moisture content, plasticity index, gradations for each major soil strata change, levels of shrink/swell potential, and levels of sulfate (on-site and borrow)." Does the Department require all of these tests on each strata? Is the Department going to require a measurement of shrink/swell potential and sulfate if the Design-Builder's Geotechnical Engineer determines that these will not affect geotechnical design recommendations?	It will be at the discretion of the Design-Build Team to conduct any additional testing, beyond that provided by the Department, as they see fit for their design. This change will be reflected in Volume II, Book 2, Section 7.2.2.1(7) of the Final RFP.
----	--	--	---

Traffic and Closures			
12	Volume I, Section 1.3.1 (page 2)	<p>This section states that lane closures are permitted during certain times (9:00-3:00) on weekdays.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will lane closures be allowed during other off-peak times? (non-holiday weekends, nights). What is the minimum allowable width of the single lane alternating one-way traffic? What is the minimum offset to concrete barrier? Are there any LD's associated with violating the 9:00-3:00 timeframe for single lane closure? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Periods of time where no closures will be allowed are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Weekdays: 3:00pm-6:00pm Saturdays: 11:00am-1:00pm All day Sunday Contract Designated Legal Holidays <p>These changes will be reflected in the Final RFP.</p> The minimum allowable width of single-lane alternating one-way traffic shall be 14' for soft barrier (cones/barrels) and 16' for solid barriers (concrete). There are no LD's associated with such a violation, the Department expects the Design-Build Team to comply with all contract requirements.
13	Volume I, Section 1.3.1, Paragraph 5 (page (2)	Could we have lane closures on the weekends?	See answer to Question #12(a).
14	No Reference Provided	Will it be acceptable reduce the temporary design speed through the construction zone?	Any proposed temporary design speed reductions shall be requested and justified in the Traffic Management Plan and must be approved by the Department's Traffic Engineer.

Draft Request for Proposals Question and Response Matrix

15	Volume I, Section 1.3.1 (page 2)	(a) How will minimizing impacts on the traveling public be evaluated? (b) What is an acceptable impact for one lane, two-way alternating traffic control?	<p>a. Specific to the referenced section, minimizing impacts to the traveling public as stated in Volume I, Section 1.2 (page 1) under Project Goals (A) will be evaluated by the number of proposed closure days, as stated in the section. Minimizing impacts the travelling public will also be evaluated under Schedule Solutions of the Technical Proposal as summarized in Volume I, Section 5.4.1.1 (page 33).</p> <p>b. The acceptable impact for one-lane, two-way alternating traffic control is a back-up less than ¼ mile as described in Volume II, Book 1, Appendix 1 (page 10).</p>
16	Volume II, Book 1, Section 4.2.1 (page 27)	This section indicates that the 14 days of closure may not begin before May 2020 commencement at UNH and may not extend beyond August 28, 2020. Will the closure be allowed over Memorial Day weekend and/or July 4th weekend?	Volume II, Book 1, Section 4.2.1 will be revised to reflect a closure period that may not begin before July 7, 2020 and may not extend beyond August 28, 2020.
17	Volume I, Section 1.3.1 (page 2)	Are there performance criteria for the type of surface that must be maintained during the maintenance of traffic along US Route 4? Can traffic be maintained on non-paved surfaces?	During the non-closure period, traffic (vehicular and bicycles) will be allowed on non-paved, structurally supportive surface which shall be passable for bike access, and shall be maintained in smooth, dust free condition for all cross lateral and longitudinal drainage removal and installation; and for pre-closure construction to adjust the US Route 4 profile. The maximum number of days allowed for travel on non-paved surface for US Route 4 profile adjustment shall not exceed twenty-one (21) total days. The maximum differential between travel lanes during non-work hours shall not exceed 1.5 inches and shall be clearly delineated. The maximum number of days allowed for travel on non-paved surface for drainage trenches shall not exceed five (5) consecutive days.
18	Volume II, Book 2, Section 7.5.2.1, last paragraph (Page 87)	What is the purpose of the DMS west of the project limits?	A full explanation of the DMS location is provided in the <u>TSMO DMS Report</u> under "Resource Documents" on the project webpage.
19	Volume II, Book 2, Section 7.8 (page 97)	please define "supporting traffic analyses"	The Design-Build Team shall provide the appropriate level of traffic analysis to convince the reviewers that the proposed Traffic Management Plan is feasible.
20	Volume II, Book 2, Section 2.8 (page 13)	Can it be assumed that the identified limits of work also represent the limits of permanent signing?	The identified limits of work also represent the limits of permanent signing. This permanent signing does not include the DMS.

Draft Request for Proposals Question and Response Matrix

21	Volume I, Section 1.3.1 (page 2)	Will the team have access to use existing NHDOT DMS along US Route 4?	No, the team will not have access to the DMS. During the closure period TSMO will be using the board to help with the regional Smart Work Zone.
22	Volume II, Book 2, Section 7.8.1 (page 97)	Please provide further guidance on the amount of detail required for the detour plans with respect to showing location, alignment, grade, typical cross section, protective fixtures and signing for the designated detour route. Developing alignment and grade plans for the established roadways indicated in the detour plans is an unnecessary burden.	Please provide enough detail to clearly identify any change to the existing road being utilized for the detour.

Best Value Determination			
23	Volume I, Exhibit D, Form N-1 (page 4)	Will the Contract Price form be revised to reflect the \$75k/day incentive for a bridge closure less than 14 days?	The Contract price form will not be revised to reflect the \$75,000/day incentive. The \$75,000/day will only be applied when assessing the proposal's Price Value as described in Volume I, Section 5.2 (page 30) and Section 5.6.2 (page 36)
24	Volume II, Book 1, Section 17.1 (page 124)	If the contractor proposes a bridge closure of less than 14 days and then exceeds the closure duration they proposed, and there is a disincentive, will it be in the form of Supplemental Liquidated Damages?	The number of closure days proposed by the Design-Build Team becomes set as the contract closure duration and any exceedance will be subject to a \$75,000/day disincentive. Liquidated Damages apply to "Final Completion" and "Final Acceptance" as outlined in Volume II, Book 1, Section 17.1 (page 124). As long as the exceedance does not affect these deadlines only the \$75,000/day disincentive will be applied. In addition, if the extended closure affects these deadlines the Disincentive will supersede Liquidated Damages.
25	Volume I, Section 5.6.2 (page 36)	If the contractor proposes a bridge closure of less than 14 days and then exceeds the closure duration they proposed, will there be a disincentive and if yes how much will it be per day?	See answer to Question #24.
26	Volume I, Exhibit D, Form N-1 (page 4) Volume II, Book 2, Section 6.3.5 (page 71)	If the contractor uses the concrete barrier bridge rail system there is a \$75,000 reduction in the Design Builder's Price Value. Please clarify/confirm that this is only a reduction in the Price Value for the purposes of evaluating the proposal, and not a \$75,000 reduction to the contractor's actual contract price. Contract Price form N-1 shows this as a credit.	This is only a \$75,000 reduction in the Design-Build Team's Price Value and will not have an effect on the actual contract price. Form N-1 will be updated to reflect this in the Final RFP
27	No Reference Provided	The 70%-Price, 30%-Technical selection percentages do not value quality sufficiently. Please revise to 60%-Price, 40%-Technical to help ensure that NHDOT receives the best value, high quality project.	The Department will maintain 70% -Price and 30% -Technical in order to allow for innovation in the project's engineering.

Draft Request for Proposals Question and Response Matrix

28	Volume I, Section 5.2 (page 30)	Will NHDOT consider awarding this project based exclusively on low price if all contractual requirements are met (i.e. pass/fail for all technical requirements). Or alternatively, will NHDOT consider reducing the weighting of the technical score to something less than the current 30%? 30% for technical score seems excessive for a project of this size.	See answer to Question #27
----	---------------------------------	---	----------------------------

Settlement			
29	No Reference Provided	Please specify the reasonably attainable requirement for settlement that ties in how much future maintenance cost is associated with settlement.	The Department is expecting to come back to the site in 8-10 years as part of its recurring resurfacing program. The Design-Build Team should consider this expectation in developing a design that would not create a settlement problem at the site requiring an earlier resurfacing. This doesn't mean that all the settlement needs to be treated; however, it should be made clear to the Department how the proposed design addresses anticipated vertical and differential settlement.
30	Volume I, Exhibit B, Section 4.2.1.4 (page 12)	With regards to the settlement criteria, if an entire roadway settles 6 inches uniformly, it may not present a performance issue for the roadway. It is differential settlement that affects performance. For settlement criteria will NHDOT consider revising the requirements to the following that we recommend? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. less than 3 inches post-construction differential settlement between the existing lateral limits of pavement and the proposed filled shoulder/lane; b. less than 3 inches post-construction differential settlement between the back of the approach slab (earth-supported) and the bridge (pile supported) 	The Department is reluctant to specify specific settlement criteria that may limit design concepts. The concept proposed by the Design-Build Team should address short and long-term settlement potential at the site with their design.
31	Volume I, Exhibit B, Section 4.2.1.4 (page 12)	This section states that the proposal shall provide a description of the geotechnical components, including at a minimum bridge foundations and efforts and commitment to address any settlement over 1" 12 months after completion of the roadway. It is our opinion that the settlement criteria should be performance-based and that 1-inch will be unreasonable and impractical to achieve. What is the requirement for the commitment to address settlement? Is this a warranty requirement?	It is agreed that the settlement should be performance based and not necessarily adhere to the 1" stated in the proposal. In other words, the proposed project concept should describe expected short term settlement and how it will be addressed in the project improvements and also describe long-term settlement and how it will affect future performance of the project. This change will be reflected in Volume I, Exhibit B, Section 4.2.1.4 of the Final RFP.

Draft Request for Proposals Question and Response Matrix

Environmental			
32	No Reference Provided	Please confirm that the Department will be completing all the environmental permitting work.	All environmental permitting work based on the BTC will be completed by the Department. However, if any substantial change is proposed by the Design-Build Team, the work to prepare permitting adjustments for such changes shall be completed by the Design-Build Team to be submitted by the Department to the appropriate permitting agency.
33	No Reference Provided	(a) Please confirm that the wetland impacts shown on the Department-provided schematics, post-hearing plans will meet the requirement to “minimize” tidal wetlands. (b) Would a shorter bridge be in conflict with the DOT’s goal to minimize wetland impacts?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Yes, these plans meet the requirement to “minimize” tidal wetland impacts. b. A shorter bridge will need to receive approval from the permitting agencies and be an approved ATC.
34	Volume II, Book 2, Section 7.2.2.1 (page 79)	Indicates “If environmentally-sensitive conditions are encountered during the subsurface exploration activities, Design-Builder shall undertake appropriate actions in accordance with Section 6.” Are any environmental tests or PID readings required? There does not seem to be any specific requirements listed in Section 6 Environmental.	No tests or PID readings are required. If the Design-Build Team encounters any environmentally-sensitive conditions they shall contact the Department’s Bureau of Environment contamination program which will organize a site evaluation.
35	No Reference Provided	Please clarify noise mitigation requirements.	No noise mitigation required.
36	No Reference Provided	Permitting requirements for the work will include vibration monitoring during construction for the preservation of adjacent historic and non-historic structures. Which structures are these?	There is no environmental commitment for vibration monitoring. The Design-Build Team may opt to provide vibration monitoring to mitigate possible risk. If blasting is proposed monitoring is required in accordance with NHDOT Standard Specifications.
37	No Reference Provided	Please clarify what the Design-Builders will be evaluated on regarding the performance measures for: “Minimizing”: (a) environmental impacts, (b) project impacts to properties, (c) long-term maintenance, (d) noise, (e) future maintenance costs from settlement.	<p>The Design-Build Team will be evaluated based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Additional impacts to the environment from the BTC b. Additional impacts to properties from the BTC c. Details that allow for lower long-term maintenance needs d. Whether or not the concrete barrier or other items are included to reduce noise to the adjacent properties e. Based on the anticipated amount of future settlement and what measures will be necessary to mitigate
38	No Reference Provided	Please confirm that a design consistent with the CE document accomplishes this. Please define “new” water quality standards.	“New” is intended to refer to “current” water quality standards. This change will be reflected in Volume I, Section 1.3.1.

Draft Request for Proposals Question and Response Matrix

39	<p>1) General Project Description and Scope of Work</p> <p><i>Specific primary elements:</i> <i>Replacement of the concrete slab superstructure and stone/concrete abutment at a raised profile to accommodate future Sea-Level rise and storm surge as shown on the Post Hearing Preliminary Plan and Profile.</i> And in the Technical Specifications: <i>The replacement structure will need to accommodate the Q100 elevation (spring high tide including tidal storm surge) plus an additional 1 foot of freeboard below the low superstructure elevation. This elevation also accommodates the Mean High-Water elevation plus 3.9 feet of predicted sea-level rise by the year 2100.</i></p>	<p>The GM2 Hydraulic and Scour Report dated November 2017 does not mention sea-level rise.</p> <p>Please confirm that the Department's hydraulic study shows a Q100 elevation for the 76' bridge of 7.0' and the lowest elevation of the bridge bottom chord at 8.0' (1' freeboard) includes the 3.9' of future sea-level rise as indicated in the RFP? The MHW elevation shown in the study is 4.0'.</p>	<p>The hydraulic study assesses the Q100+freeboard separate from the Mean High Water Elevation+Future Sea-Level Rise. Therefore the 7'+1'=8' and 4'+3.9'= 7.9' are independent. Both criteria are satisfied by the BTC.</p>
----	--	---	---

Draft Request for Proposals Question and Response Matrix

Roadway			
40	No Reference Provided	<p>"Increase the overall cross-section of US Route 4 by providing for an 12-5 typical as a minimum from Sta 110+00 to Sta 126+40 as shown on the Post Hearing Preliminary Plan and Profile to provide for safe passage of bicyclists... and Addresses the crest on US Route 4 between the bridge and Morgan Way to correct vertical sight distance issues."</p> <p>Please confirm that the Route 4 proposed profile as shown in the Project Schematics accomplished this.</p>	Yes, the intent is to provide at least the minimum intersection sight distance from Morgan Way for a 45mph design speed. (500ft) This intent is achieved by the proposed BTC profile.
41	Volume I, Section 1.3.1 (page 2)	<p>This section calls for an 12-5 typical as a minimum, while Volume II, Section 7.4.2.1.2, page 85 states "US Route 4 shall have two 11' or 12' wide through lanes, an 11' wide left turn lane at Morgan Way intersection, and 5' shoulders."</p> <p>Please clarify the minimum lane width.</p>	The minimum lane widths shall be 12' for the through lanes and 11' for the left hand turn lane at Morgan Way. This clarification will be reflected in Volume II, Book 2, Section 7.4.2.1 (2). The current BTC shows an 11' wide westbound through lane between the bridge and Morgan Way. This should be revised to reflect the 12' minimum lane width.
42	No Reference Provided	<p>Pavement design by the Design-Builder is required per RFP. NHDOT uses the AASHTO Empirical Pavement Design procedure for the structural design of highways. Will this be the required design procedure? Will other design methods/software be allowed? Instead, will NHDOT dictate the pavement section?</p>	The Department uses the pavement design method in Volume 1, Chapter 7, page 7-17 of the NHDOT Highway Design Manual. The pavement design will be subject to review for adequacy and acceptance with the selected Design-Build Team once their design is developed, not in this phase. Also, there is a Pavement Design Report for this project posted on the website that may be referenced.
43	No Reference Provided	<p>Please provide specific guidance for NHDOT's roadway lighting of this project.</p>	No new permanent lighting is proposed by the Department.
44	No Reference Provided	<p>The Draft RFP indicates that the embankment instrumentation shall be left in working condition and turned over to the NHDOT, along with readout equipment at the completion of the project. Are there more specifics to come about instrumentation?</p>	If the Design-Build Team installs any instrumentation as part of their design that is still functional at the end of the project, especially if it should be monitored post construction, then this would be applicable.
45	No Reference Provided	<p>Did NHDOT conduct global stability evaluations for the proposed bridge approach embankments shown in the BTC design? If so, what were the results?</p>	The global stability evaluations were not conducted specifically for the BTC. However, the Department conducted a preliminary embankment stability evaluation based on typical seacoast soil properties only and determined that it was feasible to construct the embankment and maintain stability with the proper engineering.

Draft Request for Proposals Question and Response Matrix

Utilities			
46	No Reference Provided	Is the Design-Builder responsible for all utility coordination? Will NHDOT Utilities Section have any involvement?	A utility relocation concept has been developed in coordination with the utility companies. Plans and cross sections depicting the utility relocation concept are posted to the project website under the "Base Technical Concept" section. (https://www.nh.gov/dot/projects/durham16236/index.htm) This is the only Utility location information currently available. It will be the Design-Build Team's responsibility to work with the utilities in developing an alternative relocation concept if desired to facilitate their proposal.
47	Volume II, Book 1, Section 6.2 (page 40L)	What utility location information is currently available?	See answer to Question #46.
48	Volume I, Section 1.3.1, last paragraph (page 2)	It will be very difficult for the D-B contractor to negotiate with utilities in that the D-B contractor has no contractual or legal connection with the utilities. It may be impossible to get commitments from the utilities relative to costs or schedule prior to submittal of the proposal. Can NHDOT take responsibility for and/or assist with utility negotiations?	See answer to Question #46.

Requested Files			
49	No Reference Provided	Are plans available for the pre-1933 bridge? If so, please provide.	No additional information is available beyond what is shown in the 1933 bridge plans.
50	No Reference Provided	Please provide MicroStation and InRoads files for all plans provided by NHDOT as .PDF's	These files will be posted to the Department's FTP site. Information on accessing the FTP site will be provided directly to the Design-Build Team's respective Authorized Representatives.
51	No Reference Provided	Are existing Route 4 roadway plans and structural section available to know what exists for a pavement section at the tie-ins?	Past projects and roadway plans may be found through the NHDOT Project Viewer (http://gis.dot.nh.gov/projectviewer/). Please note these plans may not accurately reflect existing pavement depth/overlays or other maintenance treatments.

Miscellaneous			
52	No Reference Provided	What is the timeline for ROW acquisitions and timing requirements for potential adjustment to real property takings?	ROW acquisitions based on the BTC are expected by June 2019. All other potential adjustments are the responsibility of the Design-Build Team.

Draft Request for Proposals Question and Response Matrix

53	Volume I, Section 4.5.2 (page 27)	It seems unrealistic based on current market volatility to expect the contractor to keep the proposal open for up to 180 days. Also, contractors bid projects based on when the work will be executed. Delaying the project 6 months could turn a summer project into a winter project with significant cost ramifications. Will NHDOT consider reducing the length of time the proposal is required to be kept open?	The length will be reduced to 90 days; this will include the current standard of 60 days plus 30 days to address any protests. This change will be reflected in the Final RFP.
54	Volume II, Book 2, Section 7.5.4 (page 87)	Why are pavement marking layouts required to have 1-week notice when signs to be staked out only require 72-hour notice? 72-hour notice is typical for Dig Safe mark-out.	For consistency, the Department will require 3 working days' notice for both pavement marking layouts and sign layouts, in order to allow NHDOT sufficient time to perform their review. This change will be reflected in the Final RFP.
55	Volume II, Book 1, Section 7.4.6 (page 52 & 53)	The Liquidated Damages associated with key personnel who are not available or do not maintain active involvement is totally arbitrary in that it is determined by NHDOT in its sole discretion. If there is an issue between what the Design-Builder is providing and what NHDOT expects, there should be a mechanism to discuss and negotiate the issues rather than assess LD's.	No, the Department wishes to maintain continuity and expected level of experience for key personnel. See Volume II, Book 1, Section 7.4.6.
56	Volume II, Book 1, Section 17 (page 124)	Will Liquidated damages be assessed for Warranty work during the Warranty period after Final Acceptance (Volume II, Book 1, Section 11, page 68).	Liquidated damages will not be assessed for Warranty work during the Warranty period after Final Acceptance.
57	Volume 1, Section 5.4.2 (page 35)	What numerical scores are associated with "Excellent", "Good", "Fair", and "Meets Minimum"?	90-100% - Excellent 80-89% - Good 70-79% - Fair 60-69% - Meets Minimum
58	No Reference Provided	Clarify if NHDOT expects each D-B team to evaluate future maintenance costs using a Life-Cycle Cost Analysis (LCCA) of the Design-Builder's bridge. If so, please provide the Department's LCCA of the 76' long bridge as-designed for the Proposal as a baseline.	The Department does not expect any LCCA evaluation; the Department will score the Design-Build Team's proposal on elements used that have been shown to reduce life cycle costs, especially in the project's salt water environment.
59	No Reference Provided	Please clarify what the Design-Builders will be evaluated on regarding the performance measures for: The Bunker Creek Bridge shall be replaced with a low maintenance structure that will reduce life cycle cost.	See answer to Question #58.
60	Volume II, Book 2, Section 7.8.5.1 (page 101)	What is "sufficient time for review" of the TMP? What is "a reasonable amount of time" for the re-submittal of the TMP?	The timeline for review and resubmittal of all TMP submittals shall be 14 days. In addition, the timeline for review of each Traffic Control Plan shall be 14days. These clarifications shall be reflected in Volume II, Book 2, Section 7.8.5.

Draft Request for Proposals Question and Response Matrix

61	Volume II, Book 1, Section 12.2.1 (page 73)	It appears that payments will be monthly. We request that payments to be made twice per month typical with other NHDOT projects.	The Department will uphold current NHDOT Standard Specifications requiring payments be made once a month.
62	Volume I, Section 1.5 (page 4)	Lists documents comprising the RFP. It includes Special Provisions (Book 3). Book 3 does not seem to be on the DOT website. Can Book 3 be provided?	Special Provisions will be provided based on the BTC. These Special Provisions may not cover all those necessary for the entire project, if the Design-Build Team sees the need for any additional Special Provisions they shall be provided by the Design-Build Team.
63	Volume II, Book 1 (Page 71, 72)	(a)What is anticipated time for issuance of NTP2? (b)Please explain "The initial Contract Price shall be the lump sum amount of \$5,000,000." (12.1.1) (c) Section 12.1.5 gives the Design-Builder no rights due to delays in issuance of NTP2. (d) Section 15.10, p. 115 gives NHDOT up to 18 months to issue NTP 2. This amount of risk for the Design-Builder appears unacceptable.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The time to issuance of NTP2 is dependent on the time it takes the Design-Build Team to submit the requirements stated in Volume II, Book 1, Section 4.1.3 (page 26). b. Volume II, Book1, Section 12.1.1 will be revised to provide a blank space where the Design-Build Team will insert their Contract Price. c. Section 12.1.5 gives the Design-Build Team no rights in regards to delays caused by the Design-Build Team. This will remain unchanged. d. The timeframe will be reduced to 12 months. This change will be reflected in the Final RFP.
64	No Reference Provided	Proposal page limit is 50, plus Executive Summary, Resumes, Appendices, and Exhibits. Do the Forms count as pages?	Forms contained in the appendices and exhibits do not count towards the 50 page limit as specified in Volume I, Exhibit B, Section 2 (page 1).
65	Volume I, Section 4.3.2 (page 26) Volume II, Book 1, Sections 21.1 and 21.1.1 (page 148)	Do the Escrowed Proposal Documents go both to the escrow agent and to a locked fireproof cabinet at NHDOT's offices? Please clarify/confirm that the Escrowed Proposal Documents will only be available for NHDOT review in connection with negotiation of Change Orders or the resolution of disputes.	The Escrowed Proposal Documents go to both the Escrow Agent and to a fireproof cabinet at the NHDOT offices. These documents shall be available for review in the case of Change Orders and the resolution of disputes as described in Volume II, Book 1, Section 21.1.1. All reviews will be with both the Department and the Design-Build Team present.
66	No Reference Provided	Will there be fuel cost adjustment factors or another mechanism in the contract to allow for price adjustments if fuel prices change significantly?	No fuel adjustments will be made, the risk associated with such adjustments shall be accommodated by the Design-Build Teams in their pricing.
67	No Reference Provided	Please clarify the difference between "Design Builder" and "Design-Build Team" as used throughout the RFP Documents.	Design-Builder, Design Builder, and Design-Build Team shall all hold the same meaning as defined in Volume I, Exhibit A (page 1) and Volume 2, Appendix 1 (page 11).